

The Charlotte Journal.

"Perpetual Vigilance is the Price of Liberty," for "Power is always Stealing from the Many to the Few."

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.
AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

CHARLOTTE, N. C. APRIL 24, 1850.

NUMBER 21.

SPEECH OF
Edward Stanly, of North-Carolina,
Delivered in the House of Representatives,
MARCH 6, 1850.

But I must hurry on; one word as to the Wilnot proviso. I shall not discuss the constitutional question. The subject is worn out. It would be as great an outrage to the south as it would be to the north. The southern people, with great unanimity, believe, as I do, that to enact the Wilnot Proviso would be an act of gross injustice and wrong. And though as a private citizen, and as a member of the State Legislature, I have opposed the suggestion of a dissolution of the Union, should it be adopted, yet I believe the people of my State will feel called upon, if it is enacted in any law this session, to consult in a State Convention if it is not time to inquire whether our northern brethren intend to regard us as equals, or to treat us with unkindness? Whatever North Carolina does, I shall abide by. She will not, without great cause of complaint, be driven to think of dissolution. I believe the minds of a large majority of both parties there regard with horror the thought of dissolution; but if your legislation here impresses upon the mind of her people that you are unfriendly to us, she will, without bluster or threats, provide for her honor and security in such a manner as the world will justify. I will not believe you will enact the Wilnot proviso. There is no necessity for it. I have too good an opinion of our northern members to believe it. I admit that new States, after they are admitted, can either tolerate or prohibit slavery. Then there is no practical question at issue. The northern States are stronger than the southern. But I hope they will remember, though it is "excellent to have a giant's strength, it is tyrannous to use it as a giant." And tyrannous legislation must produce sectional animosities.

While on this subject, I wish to say a few words to my colleague (Mr. Clingman) upon the constitutional question. I wish I had time to read at length some extracts of his speech; but I have not—I will print them.

From Mr. Clingman's speech, December 22, 1847, on the slavery question: [Appendix to the Congressional Globe, 30th Congress, 1st session.]

"I am now brought, Mr. Chairman, to the direct consideration of the great question, as to the extent of the powers and duties of Congress in relation to slavery in the Territories of the United States. Upon this subject a distinguished politician from the South, (Mr. Calhoun), in the other wing of this building, some twelve months since, laid down certain doctrines which are, in substance, as near as I can remember them, these: The territories of the United States, being the common property of the Union, are held by Congress in trust for the use and benefit of all the States and their citizens. Secondly, that Congress has no right to exclude, by law, any citizen of the United States from going into any part of said territories, and carrying with them, and holding any such property as they are allowed to hold in the States from which they come. This view, though perhaps plausible at the first glance, is really the most shallow and superficial that could possibly be presented. Admitting the first general proposition to be true, (and no fair mind can question it), that the territories of the United States are held by Congress in trust for the use and benefit of all the States and their citizens, I am free to confess, that if Congress should see that it was most advantageous to allow all the citizens to occupy the territory in common with the property, it doubtless ought so to provide. But it is equally clear that if on the other hand, Congress should see that all the citizens of the United States could not thus advantageously occupy all the territories in common, it might divide the same so as to assign certain portions to particular classes or persons.

Again:

"As the power that can be exercised belongs to Congress alone. Congress has power to make all needful rules and regulations. But the wants of the Territories may be, and in fact are, just as great as those of the States. It seems to me, then, Mr. Chairman, with due deference to those who have given the subject greater consideration than I have been able to do, that Congress, in legislation for the territories, is controlled only by the constitution of the United States. It is equally true, however, that the people of the several States are likewise controlled by this Constitution. Whether acting in convention or through their ordinary legislative governments, they can do nothing contrary to it.

"Congress, then, has ever the Territory just such powers as its Legislature would have after it has become a State. Both are controlled by the Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of the land. As this Constitution is silent in relation to slavery, it has been urged on the one hand that Congress can do nothing to exclude it from the Territory. On the other hand, it is asserted with equal confidence, that for the same reason there is no power to establish the institution. These two opposite views are worthy antagonists, and I shall leave them to contend, not fearing that either will ever obtain a victory over the other."

"If, then, Congress possesses general legislative powers over the Territories, as I contend, it is idle to deny that slavery may either be permitted or forbidden to exist there."

In another part of my colleague's speech,

he gives utterance to opinions rather contradictory to those just quoted. The inconsistency is glaring; but it is fairer upon such a subject to quote it than to withhold it:

"I do not pretend that any section of the Union can insist fairly that territory should be acquired for her benefit. We are doubtless all bound, in good faith, to adhere to the Constitution and Union, with such boundaries as it had, when we became parties to it. But I do say, that if the Government should acquire territory, it takes it under the Constitution, for the benefit of all; and a decree that any section, or its citizens, shall be excluded from all such territory, would be a great violation of the Constitution as the Government could possibly commit. Such is substantial. This proposed exclusion of slavery from all the territories heretofore to be acquired."

If the author of this speech means anything, it must be this:—that after territory is acquired, Congress possesses general legislative powers; and slavery may either be permitted or forbidden to exist there; but if Congress shall decree that slavery shall be excluded, "from all the Territories heretofore to be acquired," it will be as great a violation as the Government could possibly commit!

So, I cannot understand how these views can exist in the same mind at one and the same time. It looks as if one part of the speech was addressed to a Whig Bureaucracy and another part to a Democratic Bureaucracy: one to the eastern Bureaucracy and the other to the western Bureaucracy.

It reminds me of a verse I read somewhere in my youth, made by one just beginning to write verses—and his first should have been his last—so described a fight on the water, and wrote—

"The stranger and his crew then stormed the boat, And all at once jumped in and all at once jumped out."

And further, upon the constitutional question, my colleague argued very properly, that there could be no difficulty for speaking of the Missouri compromise, he said:

"There was, however, a settlement made at length, upon terms which, though unequal to the South, were not at variance with the spirit of the Constitution."

My colleague is regarded now in some parts of the South—even in South Carolina—as very sound upon the slavery question. I have been denounced as unsound for entertaining precisely the same opinions as my colleague does.

And upon the general justice of the duty of the General Government to protect slave property, I desire, in passing, to say, I heard with pleasure the able and statesmanlike argument of the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Toombs), made here a few days ago. It gave me more pleasure to add my feeble tribute of commendation to this speech—though I do not agree in all the gentleman said—because the gentleman's opposition to his own friends, and his course in this House before we were organized, met with my decided condemnation. And what is this in mind, I will beg to say one word to another gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Stephens).

Before we were organized, that gentleman was understood to call down curses on all those who would not stand up for their section. I made allowance for the gentleman's excited feelings, but I heard the remark with pleasure. I had read his eloquent speeches with profit and with pleasure, and I had anticipated the pleasure of doing my duty here under his lead, and when, he, and his friends who acted with him, (Messrs. Toombs, Hubbard, and others), in the southern caucus, voted against Mr. Calhoun's Southern address, and did not "stand up for a section," I approved their conduct. When he, and the estimable, and highly talented gentleman, my predecessor, (Mr. Dixon), and six other southern gentlemen, were denounced as traitors, for voting to lay Clayton's compromise bill on the table, I defended their course. And without having had an opportunity in the midst of professional pursuits, to examine that bill, I defended their conduct at home, from my knowledge of their character, and justified their not standing up for a section." According to Mr. Calhoun's platform of amending the Constitution, even the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Foote), who have within a day or two heard, cannot stand up with Mr. C. for his section. Our worthy Speaker, in that southern convention could not stand up, according to the address, for "his section." He thought the doughfaces had not had justice done them; the address was against the whole North. The author of that address, who endeavored to excite the public mind, only recommended to the South "to be united;" but has recently, by his ultraism, denigrated them and I should be glad to know which side the Nashville convention will take. And I should be glad to be informed why those who censure others for not standing up for a section, did not vote for a southern Speaker, when the contest was between a northern and southern Speaker. But I hope the gentleman from Georgia will come back, and let the whole country have the aid of his abilities; and I express now the wish that was in my mind when the gentleman invoked his curses—I hope "the accusing spirit" blushed as he gave it in, and the recording angel dropped a tear upon the word, and blotted it out forever."

A single word to the gentleman from Florida, (Mr. Cabell), who took part against his friends in the early part of the session. I hope, before he aids to bring about a dissolution, he will see that his constituents can take care of the Indians at home without the aid of the General Government.

I desire now to notice, very briefly, a few remarks of my colleague's speech, delivered this session. There are some portions of my colleague's remarks which I hope were uttered without due consideration. He spoke of a "collision as inevitable, and the sooner it came the better." What kind of collision did he mean? He made statements of the "existing revenue system operating hardly on the South." How? Does he mean the Democratic British tariff of 1846? And yet he says: "Looking, therefore, at all these different elements, in greater increase of population, more wealth, and less poverty and crime, we have reason to rejoice, and our people are prosperous and happy." Then, I ask, how does the existing revenue system operate hardly upon us? For my colleague says: "Nor is it true we are poorer than the North, for the slaveholding States are much richer, in proportion to their population, than the free."

I should be glad to know what facts his my colleague discovered, to cause him to change his opinions on the tariff question. In his speech, delivered this session, he used some phrases that I think I have heard from Mr. Calhoun and Mr. McDuffie; but in 1841, my colleague made a speech, in which he expressed opinions that did him honor.

I have some quotations before me from that speech which I will print.

Extracts from Mr. Clingman's speech—[from the Appendix Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, first session:]

"We (the Whigs) are in favor of such a tariff as will produce all the revenue necessary to the support of the government, economically administered, without the money arising from the sales of the public lands."

He was opposed to a "horizontal tariff," by which I suppose he meant the compromise act of 1833, or the South Carolina tariff. In '44, my colleague advocated "incidental protection to our manufacturers and artisans, to sustain our own industry, against the oppressive regulations of others, and counteract, as far as practicable, the hostile restrictions of foreign nations." Good Whig doctrine. My colleague took then "a common-sense, practical view of this question. We have had theory and parade enough on it." What theory, except the South Carolina theory, that the "existing revenue system operates hardly on the South."

In 1841, when this speech was delivered, the tariff of '42 was in operation. The tariff of '46 is said, by its friends, to be a "free-trade tariff." I say, it is a tariff for the benefit of English labor. How could my colleague advocate the tariff of '42 and think the existing system "operates hardly on the South."

How his opinions have changed since 1844 when he spoke of the tariff of 1842: "This favorable state of our finances has been produced, thus far, without any practical injury having resulted to any section of the country. Not only cotton, but all of our other productions, command a better price than they did before the passage of the tariff; while foreign articles which we import and consume are generally cheaper; I believe I might say, invariably so."

And upon this tariff, which is spoken of in some portion of the southern country as an "aggression on the South," I wish I had time to read an extract from a speech of as true-hearted a southern gentleman as breathes: from one of spotless reputation, and whose high talents and character have shed honor on his country. I will print some extracts from his speech.

Extract from the speech of Mr. Berrien, of Georgia, April 9, 1844—[Appendix to the Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, 1st Session:]

Mr. Berrien was referring to the charge that the South was "oppressed." He said he was "speaking as a southern man," and he was disputing the charge that there was suffering. He might have been accused of not "standing up for his section." But he argued as follows:

"It is a mere question of fact; and I answer it by affirming—that I presume no one will deny—that there is a sensible, obvious improvement in the condition of the country since August, 1842. Whether it be because of the tariff of that year, or in spite of it, I repeat, is not a subject of my present inquiry; I am dealing with fact, not theory; and these things I take to be undeniable in the comparison between the two periods:

"1. The credit of the Government was prostrate, and it has been redeemed. Its bills were protested. Its treasury notes were below par. It sought a loan and could not obtain it, either here or in Europe, but upon terms which were humiliating to a great nation. It could not go into the market and borrow money on terms as favorable as would be accorded to a responsible individual. All this has been changed. Its stock is above par. The Government has ample means to meet its current expenditures, and such is now its credit that it could command on loan any amount of money it might require."

"2. The treasury was empty. It is now replenished, has an increasing income probably adequate to its wants, and the means, if need be, of adding to it."

"3. The commerce and navigation of the country have increased."

"4. Its agricultural condition has improved."

"5. There has been a marked improvement in the price of our great staple."

"6. A reduction of prices of almost all, if not absolutely of every article of consumption."

"7. To crown the whole, every branch of industry has been stimulated to increased activity, and confidence has been restored."

"Mr. President: It is pressed upon us in this argument that the act of 1842 imposed

undue and peculiar burdens on southern industry—on the planting interests of the South. This, sir, is to me an awakening suggestion—the burden, if it exists, operating alike on my constituents and myself, and upon me, personally, to the whole extent of the productive property which I possess. A little reflection, however, relieves me from apprehension. I know that any tax which the Government can impose, in so far as it operates upon consumption, can only compel the southern planter to share in the burden which all consumers have to bear. Experience satisfies me too that this cannot be to the whole amount of duty, but the foreign producer must bear his proportion of it in the diminished profits of capital. I know that the price of southern produce has not fallen since these duties were imposed. I know too that the price of articles of southern consumption have not risen, but have been sensibly diminished."

I shall surely not be blamed for an unwillingness to believe that the existing system of revenue operates hardly on the South and West. And again, I ask, why could not such a man as William Gaston—why could not our Graham and Moreheads—see this oppression?

I shall never forget a speech I heard from North Carolina's most distinguished son—Gaston—in the earlier part of my life. It was I think, at an Union meeting, after Van Winkle of the South, because he would not nullify an act of Congress. "Better, far better," said Mr. Gaston, "be called the Rip Van Winkle of the South, than the Captain Bobadill of the port—better sleep on forever, than wake to treason or disunion." These words were from the son of one whose father's blood was shed by the enemies of his country; they were from the heart and lips of a patriotic christian gentleman—who was long honored by my native State, and whose memory is still cherished by all true hearted sons. His mortal remains repose within the borders of that town in which these "words that burn" were spoken—it is a part of the country I represent. When I forget the applause these sentiments met with from that people, I shall forget them; and when I do that, my tongue will cleave to my mouth and my right hand lose her cunning."

But my colleague complains of the amount of money expended at the North, and he says: North Carolina, for example, is burdened to the extent of not less than three millions, and yet does not get back one hundred thousand dollars in any way from the government."

The clear loss in a pecuniary point of view, on account of the action of the Government, may be set down at three millions annually. The southern States generally are in the same condition."

Now, I cannot imagine how my colleague calculates this three millions of burden. I fear it is, to use his own words, a "want of accurate knowledge of all the facts renders it impossible to determine precisely the effect which our revenue system produces."

I should be glad to see these "facts" stated. I suspect my colleague is as much mistaken in this calculation as he is in the number of fugitive slaves escaping from a "few counties in Maryland" which had, within six months, upon computation, lost one hundred thousand dollars worth."

He is surely mistaken. A Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Butler) said that "thirty thousand dollars worth of slaves were stolen from Kentucky annually," and he added "the loss to the people of the slaveholding States may be estimated at two hundred thousand dollars annually." Whose computation is right? And my colleague says Delaware loses "one hundred thousand dollars" worth of slaves each year." My colleague makes the loss of a "few counties in Maryland," and the loss of the State of Delaware, as great as Mr. Butler thinks the loss of the "slaveholding States" and yet the members from Kentucky, Delaware and Maryland, do not threaten to dissolve the Union.

But the complaint is, a small amount of money is expended at the South. Whose fault is this?

Mr. Tyler vetoed a bill that contained an appropriation of twenty thousand dollars for the improvement of Cape Fear river. And when Congress made an appropriation of fifty thousand dollars for opening Roanoke inlet, on the coast of North Carolina, Mr. Tyler pocketed the bill. Is this aggression?—It was an outrage, and well-becoming a strict constructionist of the school of '98 and '99. This is a work of incalculable value to a large portion of my State. I hope to live to see it perfected. The people in mine and my colleague's (Mr. Outlaw's) district will soon hold a convention relative to this subject—a convention, not to dissolve the Union, but to open a communication by which we can reach New York by steam in a few hours—to facilitate our intercourse, and bind us together indissolubly. Virginia politicians have opposed this work and they will oppose it. Open this communication, and, in the event of domestic rebellion, we should speedily have thousands of New Yorkers—with whom our intercourse is now so frequent and so friendly—brought on the wings of steam, ready to stand by us.

Let not gentlemen complain of the North on this score. When these internal improvement questions arise I will promise to bring, ten, yes, twenty Whigs or Democrats, from the North or West, for any southern Democrat my colleague will find."

My colleague, when speaking of the possibility of a dissolution said:

"Subjecting the goods of the North to a duty, with those from other foreign countries,

would at once give a powerful stimulus to our own manufactures. We have already sufficient capital for the purpose. But if needed, it would come in from abroad. English capitalists have filled Belgium with factories. Why did this occur? Simply because provisions were cheaper and taxes lower than in England. The same motives would bring them into the southern country, since both the reasons assigned are much stronger in our case. It has already been proved that we can manufacture some kind of goods more cheaply than the North."

What would the "free trade" gentlemen of the South say to that? Would not South Carolina be oppressed by that tariff?

But we are to have "English capital."—England is too well satisfied with the tariff of '46 to lend us money to enable us to impose duties on "other foreign countries." England! who forbid our forefathers to manufacture—who punishes any man who induces an artisan to leave her shores—lend us capital! In 1844, my colleague had "no reliance on the sincerity of the British government."

Then he said: "England, who had abolished slavery in her West India islands, was seeking to interfere with the institution in other countries." I do not believe our people will be in love with this idea.

My colleague spoke of the "other acquisitions of territory" to be made "after the next Presidential election."

I do not understand what this means. I hope he does not mean that we are to engage in foreign war again, as was intimated in the Baltimore convention by Mr. Hannegan—that we should annex Yucatan and Cuba. I thought the defeat of General Cass had secured us from the dread of such horrid consequences. I advocated General Taylor's election upon the ground that he was opposed to foreign war. Are we to forbid New Mexico to become a free State if she prefers it? How far are we to go before we consent to allow a free State to exist south of us? Must we have "every man's land that adjoins our own?"

There is but one other of my colleague's remarks to which I will advert:

"Have not prominent northern politicians, of the highest positions and the greatest influence, whose names are well known to the gentlemen on this floor, already declared that there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which obstructs or ought to obstruct the abolition of slavery by Congress in the States?"

My colleague is better acquainted with politicians than I am. But I do not know any northern politician who has avowed such an opinion. Even the Buffalo convention did not go that far. Again, he says: In twenty-five years, if we are surrounded by free States, the condition of the South would be "that of Ireland; and soon, by the destruction of the remnants of the white population, become that of St. Domingo." And he adds:—"Northern men not only admit it, but constantly in their public speeches avow it to be their purpose to produce this very state of things." Sir, I must deny this. My colleague is greatly mistaken. Since I read his speech I have inquired, and I am proud to say I have been unable to learn when northern men, or one single northern man, ever avowed so atrocious a sentiment. I can hear of no such man. Surely such a wretch never contaminated this place.

I never heard of but one man so wicked as to think without horror of insurrection in the southern States; and he was a Van Buren Democrat from Ohio, (Benjamin Tappan, former Senator.)

My colleague spoke with contempt of those who uttered the "insane and senseless cry of Union, Union." He was "disgusted" at it. This disgust is but two years old.

In December, 1847, thus spoke my colleague:

"It would be vain, however, for us on either side to hope for such prosperity as we have hitherto enjoyed. If the stream of our national existence should be divided, each branch must roll a diminished volume, and would be able only to bear a lesser burden. Such a separation would be the saddest of all partings. We should feel that our way was lonely, like that of Hagar in the desert—desolate as the wandering of our first parents, when crime had just begun," &c., &c.

Very handsomely in the same train:

"We have a community of interest, which it would seem that no party madness could break up. We have, too, recollections of the past, which, to American feelings, are stronger even than calculations of interest."

This was neither insane nor senseless; but rational, and sensible, and well becoming a Representative of the old North State.

A single word as to California. This will be a "test question." The "California proviso" one gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Loge) denounced. What is it but declaring that the people of each State shall have a right to decide for themselves? We have high southern authority for this. Mr. Polk said, in his message, in 1845: "Whether Congress shall legislate or not, the people of the acquired Territories, when assembled in convention to form State constitutions, will possess the sole and exclusive power to determine for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits. If Congress shall abstain from interfering with the question, the people of these Territories will be left free to adjust it as they may think proper when they apply for admission as States into the Union. No enactment of Congress could restrain the people of any of the sovereign States of the Union, old or new,

North or South, slaveholding or non-slaveholding, from determining the character of their own domestic institutions as they may deem wise and proper. Any and all the States possess this right, and Congress cannot deprive them of it.

In the Southern Address it is said: "Slavery is a domestic institution. It belongs to the States, each for itself, to decide whether it shall be established or not; and, if it be established, whether it should be abolished or not."

The Southern Address, also, in referring to the Missouri question in 1819, censures those who advocate amendments "having for their object to make it a condition of her admission that her constitution should have a provision to prohibit slavery."

The Address states: "Those who objected to the amendments rested their opposition on the high ground of the right of self-government. They claimed that a territory, having reached the period when it is proper for it to form a constitution and government for itself, becomes fully vested with all the rights of self-government," &c., &c.

The Address argues further, that to assume that Congress had a right to require any thing but that the government must be republican, "would be tantamount to the assumption of the right to make its entire constitution and government."

I commend this Address to those Democratic members who are talking of the "California proviso."

I believe, Mr. Chairman, if we reject the application of California for admission as a State, it will be productive of the most calamitous consequences. It will raise a sectional feeling throughout this broad land that may never be allayed. I cannot vote against her admission for any reason I have yet heard. I do not see how any one can make her admission a "test question," who does not wish to bring about a dissolution of the Union. As a southern man I want her admitted—the sooner the better. I advocated the election of our present Chief Magistrate, not merely as a Whig, but as the great representative and champion of the principle of the right of man to self-government." I will not consent to remand her: her people are, most of them, our own citizens. There might be danger of our compelling her to form a government without our aid. She will, I trust, soon be one of us. If no other southern man votes as I do, I will vote for the admission of California. Dead or alive, (as an Irishman said,) if I can get here, I will vote for her admission.

A single word upon the question of Territorial governments. I see no plan better than that recommended by the President, and I shall cordially support it.

I have no time for much argument, but will only present a few questions and conclude.—As a southern man I feel indignant at the instances of violated faith and disregard of constitutional obligations on the part of some of our northern States, relative to fugitive slaves. But I believe, from all I can see and hear, they will do us justice in this respect. But is a dissolution of the Union to remedy this evil? Will not a separation greatly increase it?

If the Union is dissolved, will Abolition societies be dead? Far from it.

What is to become of all the property owned by the United States?—what of all the money in the hands of disbursing officers? Where will all the office-holders go? There will be the voice of lamentation heard in old Virginia that day! But, independent of all considerations of interest, I believe the people of the Old Dominion are truly attached to the Union. They ought to be. Her sons have "ruled its destinies." They have had a full share of its honors and offices. Sir, I believe there are office-holders enough, natives of Virginia, to whip any army of disunionists that can be raised in the State.

Why did not the Southern Democracy, who now talk of disunion, take care to provide in the Oregon bill, and other bills containing the Wilnot proviso, when Mr. Polk was President, that slavery should exist south of a certain line? No, it might have disturbed the harmony of the party.

Zachary Taylor is now President. That makes the difference.

If by any aggressions on the part of the North—which I do not anticipate—this Union is to be dissolved, I tell gentlemen North Carolina will form no part of a southern confederacy, whose ruling politicians entertain opinions like those avowed by some of the southern Democracy on this floor.—We will build our great railroad, and before we become hewers of wood and drawers of water for Virginia and South Carolina, we will try, trusting in providence, to stand up, "solitary and alone." They would soon involve us in war on account of black sailors. North Carolina has not been treated by these sisters with kindness or respect. In 1842, South Carolina passed resolutions, and sent them here, reflecting very unbecomingly on North Carolina, and intimating that she was encouraging abolition, because her people voted against Mr. Van Buren! Time has proved we were right. Virginia but a few years since in her legislature, upon some question relating to railroads, was so discourteous to North Carolina as to call for a proper but dignified rebuke from our Governor, Graham, in his message to our legislature.

Besides, the general tone of the newspapers, and sometimes public speeches of gentlemen of those States prove that they regard our people as inferior to theirs. No, sir; if we had a southern confederacy, let North Carolina go as "Hagar in the desert," rather than in company where she would be regarded as inferior. If Tennessee, our own Ten-

North or South, slaveholding or non-slaveholding, from determining the character of their own domestic institutions as they may deem wise and proper. Any and all the States possess this right, and Congress cannot deprive them of it.

In the Southern Address it is said: "Slavery is a domestic institution. It belongs to the States, each for itself, to decide whether it shall be established or not; and, if it be established, whether it should be abolished or not."

The Southern Address, also, in referring to the Missouri question in 1819, censures those who advocate amendments "having for their object to make it a condition of her admission that her constitution should have a provision to prohibit slavery."

The Address states: "Those who objected to the amendments rested their opposition on the high ground of the right of self-government. They claimed that a territory, having reached the period when it is proper for it to form a constitution and government for itself, becomes fully vested with all the rights of self-government," &c., &c.

The Address argues further, that to assume that Congress had a right to require any thing but that the government must be republican, "would be tantamount to the assumption of the right to make its entire constitution and government."

I commend this Address to those Democratic members who are talking of the "California proviso."

I believe, Mr. Chairman, if we reject the application of California for admission as a State, it will be productive of the most calamitous consequences. It will raise a sectional feeling throughout this broad land that may never be allayed. I cannot vote against her admission for any reason I have yet heard. I do not see how any one can make her admission a "test question," who does not wish to bring about a dissolution of the Union. As a southern man I want her admitted—the sooner the better. I advocated the election of our present Chief Magistrate, not merely as a Whig, but as the great representative and champion of the principle of the right of man to self-government." I will not consent to remand her: her people are, most of them, our own citizens. There might be danger of our compelling her to form a government without our aid. She will, I trust, soon be one of us. If no other southern man votes as I do, I will vote for the admission of California. Dead or alive, (as an Irishman said,) if I can get here, I will vote for her admission.

A single word upon the question of Territorial governments. I see no plan better than that recommended by the President, and I shall cordially support it.

I have no time for much argument, but will only present a few questions and conclude.—As a southern man I feel indignant at the instances of violated faith and disregard of constitutional obligations on the part of some of our northern States, relative to fugitive slaves. But I believe, from all I can see and hear, they will do us justice in this respect. But is a dissolution of the Union to remedy this evil? Will not a separation greatly increase it?

If the Union is dissolved, will Abolition societies be dead? Far from it.

What is to become of all the property owned by the United States?—what of all the money in the hands of disbursing officers? Where will all the office-holders go? There will be the voice of lamentation heard in old Virginia that day! But, independent of all considerations of interest, I believe the people of the Old Dominion are truly attached to the Union. They ought to be. Her sons have "ruled its destinies." They have had a full share of its honors and offices. Sir, I believe there are office-holders enough, natives of Virginia, to whip any army of disunionists that can be raised in the State.

Why did not the Southern Democracy, who now talk of disunion, take care to provide in the Oregon bill, and other bills containing the Wilnot proviso, when Mr. Polk was President, that slavery should exist south of a certain line? No, it might have disturbed the harmony of the party.

Zachary Taylor is now President. That makes the difference.

If by any aggressions on the part of the North—which I do not anticipate—this Union is to be dissolved, I tell gentlemen North Carolina will form no part of a southern confederacy, whose ruling politicians entertain opinions like those avowed by some of the southern Democracy on this floor.—We will build our great railroad, and before we become hewers of wood and drawers of water for Virginia and South Carolina, we will try, trusting in providence, to stand up, "solitary and alone." They would soon involve us in war on account of black sailors. North Carolina has not been treated by these sisters with kindness or respect. In 1842, South Carolina passed resolutions, and sent them here, reflecting very unbecomingly on North Carolina, and intimating that she was encouraging abolition, because her people voted against Mr. Van Buren! Time has proved we were right. Virginia but a few years since in her legislature, upon some question relating to railroads, was so discourteous to North Carolina as to call for a proper but dignified rebuke from our Governor, Graham, in his message to our legislature.

Besides, the general tone of the newspapers, and sometimes public speeches of gentlemen of those States prove that they regard our people as inferior to theirs. No, sir; if we had a southern confederacy, let North Carolina go as "Hagar in the desert," rather than in company where she would be regarded as inferior. If Tennessee, our own Ten-